



Press Release

## **FITCH DOWNGRADES AUTOSTRADE PER L'ITALIA'S RATING**

Rome, 8 January 2020 - The rating agency Fitch, following the unilateral changes to existing motorway concession arrangements in Italy, introduced by the Milleproroghe decree, downgraded Autostrade per l'Italia from 'BBB+' to 'BB+'.

As a result of persistent uncertainties weighing on the Company credit profile, the rating is on Rating Watch Negative.

Such decision, after a similar action recently taken by another rating agency, could trigger, as a potential effect, the request from the European Investment Bank and the Cassa Depositi e Prestiti of the early repayment - on the basis of existing agreements - of loans granted to Autostrade per l'Italia totaling approximately € 2.1 billion of which 1.8 bn guaranteed by Atlantia, with the consequent utilization of credit lines from Atlantia and Autostrade per l'Italia.

The full text of the rating agency's announcement is provided below.

Investor Relations  
e-mail: [investor.relations@autostrade.it](mailto:investor.relations@autostrade.it)

Media Relations  
e-mail: [ufficiostampa@autostrade.it](mailto:ufficiostampa@autostrade.it)

[www.autostrade.it](http://www.autostrade.it)



## Fitch Downgrades Atlantia, ASPI and AdR; Ratings on RWN

Fitch Ratings - Milan - 08 January 2020:

Fitch Ratings has downgraded Atlantia SpA's EUR10 billion euro medium-term note (EMTN) programme to 'BB' from 'BBB'. Fitch has also downgraded Autostrade per l'Italia Spa's (ASPI) Long-Term Issuer Default Ratings (IDRs) to 'BB+' from 'BBB+' and Aeroporti di Roma's (AdR) IDR to 'BBB-' from 'BBB+'. The ratings remain on Rating Watch Negative (RWN). Both ASPI and AdR are infrastructure assets managed and owned by Atlantia.

A full list of rating actions is detailed below.

### **RATING RATIONALE**

The rating action follows the Italian government's decision to unilaterally change the existing toll-road concession rules by law which, in our view, has a significant negative impact on the group's credit profile at a time when the government is considering an early termination of the ASPI concession agreement.

The probability of this significantly negative termination is on the rise as is the risk of a lengthy legal challenge by ASPI, whose timing and outcome is unpredictable at this stage. The RWN reflects significant uncertainty on future developments ranging from a renegotiation to early termination of the ASPI concession.

### **KEY RATING DRIVERS**

On 21 December, the Italian government approved a draft law-decree that unilaterally changed some key provisions of the existing Italian toll-road concessions. The decree (i) freezes tariff increases if the government-proposed new tariff system is not accepted and included in concessionaires' business plans; (ii) changes the calculation method of the indemnity to be paid in case of early termination of the concession; (iii) establishes that in case of concession revocation, the national operator of public road network ANAS SpA will take over the concessionaire's operations until the concession is retendered; (iv) most importantly from a creditors' perspective, deletes from the concession contracts the provision that subordinates the validity of concession revocation to the payment of an indemnity.

On 22 December, ASPI sent a letter to the government stating that if the provisions of the draft law decree were confirmed, the ASPI contract would be mechanically and legally terminated early as per article 9bis of the concession. This article states that should a law introduce new clauses in the contract, the concession is to be legally terminated early (after six months of the new law being introduced) unless ASPI accepts the changes within 30 days. Under this scenario, ASPI would be entitled to receive a full compensation for the early termination of the concession agreement and would continue to operate the concession until this compensation is paid.

In response to the ASPI letter, the government has added in the final version of the law decree a provision preventing concessionaires to terminate the concession early in case of changes introduced by law. We note that the law decree is legally in force from 31 December 2019 but must be ratified and may potentially

be revised by Parliament within 60 days. We also note that a party of the governing coalition has already stated its intention to propose changes to the current version of the law-decree.

The new rules, in our view, significantly alter Atlantia's group credit profile at a time when the government is considering an early termination of the ASPI concession agreement. It is likely that ASPI will challenge in court the legality of the new rules although the outcome and timing of the ruling remains highly uncertain.

In this context, a government decision to terminate the ASPI concession early would likely expose the group to a liquidity event as the recent law decree has not only changed the calculation method of the indemnity but also cancelled the contract provision that subordinates the validity of the concession termination to the payment of the indemnity. This new rule (compensation not paid at the same time of concession termination) could be disruptive in an early termination as the indemnity is the primary source for repaying bondholders and creditors who may decide to accelerate their debt repayment.

On 31 December 2019, Atlantia and ASPI had respectively EUR5.7 billion and EUR9.8 billion of gross debt, cumulated cash of EUR 1.4 billion and committed bank facilities of EUR3.25 billion (available also in case of ASPI concession revocation), compared to EUR0.6bn of debt to be repaid in 2020. There are strong linkages between Atlantia and ASPI as Atlantia guarantees around 55% of ASPI's debt. The group has also balance-sheet flexibility mainly stemming from potential disposal of its financial stakes in non-core assets such as Getlink (BB+/Stable), Hochtief, Bologna airport and/or minority stakes in its portfolio of assets.

In Fitch's view, the outcome of events is highly uncertain at this stage and open to a variety of scenarios. We outline below few non-exhaustive possible scenarios ranging from the renegotiation to the early termination of the ASPI concession.

Under the renegotiation scenario, parties will renegotiate the ASPI concession that in our view might include, among others, increased controlling powers by the grantor over concessionaire maintenance activities, potential reduction or re-profiling of future tariff growth and greater investments on the Italian road network. Under this scenario, Atlantia's consolidated rating would primarily be driven by a new leverage profile as well as by Fitch's qualitative assessment from a creditor standpoint of the new concession agreement. A variation of this scenario could be an agreement where ASPI releases its concession in exchange for a timely payment of adequate indemnity.

In case of concession revocation due to concessionaire fault, according to the rules set out in the new law decree, ASPI's network operations would be transferred to ANAS and the indemnity calculated as the sum of investments realised by the concessionaire net of depreciation. According to the new rules, the validity of the revocation is no longer subject to the payment of the indemnity and this would likely result in a liquidity event for the group.

A variation of the revocation scenario could be that ANAS takes over not only ASPI operations (as set out in the new law-decree) but also its liabilities or a share of liabilities equivalent to the indemnity calculated according to the new law decree. Under this scenario, we will reassess the ASPI debt transferred to ANAS as well as the rating of the debt left at Atlantia group level. The new Atlantia group would be a smaller infrastructure player with materially lower cash flow generation, a smaller and less diversified portfolio of assets with a shorter average concession life and a debt size dependent on the amount of liabilities being transferred to ANAS. Importantly, also in this scenario, the group would be exposed to liquidity pressure as a large share of ASPI debt transferred to ANAS would continue to have recourse to Atlantia in view of its guarantee on around 55% of current ASPI debt. However, under this scenario, Atlantia could tap into its balance-sheet flexibility to manage potential liquidity pressure.

Another possible scenario is for the government to declare the revocation of the ASPI concession, and for ASPI in turn to challenge the legality of the revocation decree in court and ask for constitutional ratification of the new concession rules and, at the same time, a suspension of the validity of the decree until the court case is concluded. If the court accepts ASPI's request, ASPI would continue to operate the concession until the court decides on the dispute. Conversely, if the court rejects ASPI's request, the operations would be

transferred to ANAS and, if a timely payment of an adequate indemnity is not forthcoming, the Atlantia group would be exposed to a liquidity event.

## IMPACT ON ADR

The rating action on AdR follows the downgrade of Atlantia, which almost fully owns AdR and governs its financial and dividend policy. Nonetheless, the 'BBB-' rating on AdR considers the limited insulation of the Rome-based airport operator from Atlantia at the current rating level, i.e. one notch above the 'BB+' consolidated rating.

There are no material ring-fencing features in ADR debt although we note that its concession agreement provides some moderate protections against material re-leveraging of the asset. Furthermore, in our view, in case of significant liquidity needs, Atlantia would prefer disposing of non-core assets or, in an extreme scenario, selling a minority stake in AdR rather than materially re-leveraging the asset and risking additional confrontation with the Italian regulator at a time when relationships are already strained.

The RWN on AdR reflects its linkages with Atlantia.

## IMPACT ON ABERTIS

Fitch is maintaining Abertis' rating and Outlook unchanged at 'BBB'/Stable as we believe the governance structure of the Spanish-based toll road operator adequately insulates Abertis from Atlantia at the current rating level, i.e. two notches above the 'BB+' consolidated rating.

Fitch has evaluated the legal and operational linkages between Atlantia's consolidated profile and Abertis as "Weak" under its Parent and Subsidiary Linkage criteria where the parent (Atlantia, 'BB+' consolidated) is weaker than the subsidiary (Abertis, 'BBB').

In particular, we believe the ability for Atlantia to extract cash from its stronger subsidiary is impaired by the presence of a large minority shareholder (ACS) whose consent is required for M&A activities and any change in the dividend policy, which also has to remain compliant with a minimum investment-grade rating of Abertis. We also note that the 50% ownership in Abertis materially reduces the amount of cash Atlantia may upstream from the asset since the remaining half would be distributed to minority shareholders. We may reassess our approach should Atlantia opt and manage to re-leverage Abertis and extract higher-than-expected cash in the future.

Fitch has not undertaken a full review on Atlantia, ASPI and AdR.

## RATING SENSITIVITIES

### Atlantia/ASPI

Developments That May, Individually or Collectively, Lead to Positive Rating Action:

-A full restoring of the existing ASPI concession rules

Developments That May, Individually or Collectively, Lead to Negative Rating Action:

-Early termination of the ASPI concession could lead to a multiple-notch downgrade, especially if there are doubts on the size and timely payment of compensation.

- In case of concession renegotiation, Atlantia's consolidated rating will be driven by the expected new group's leverage profile and the quality from a creditor standpoint of the new concession rules.

### AdR

Developments That May, Individually or Collectively, Lead to Positive Rating Action:

- A positive rating action on Atlantia

Developments That May, Individually or Collectively, Lead to Negative Rating Action:

- A negative rating action on Atlantia

















## ESG Considerations

Unless otherwise disclosed in this section, the highest level of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) credit relevance is a score of '3'. This means ESG issues are credit-neutral or have only a minimal credit impact on the entities, either due to their nature or to the way in which they are being managed by the entities.

Atlantia has an ESG relevance score of '4' for Management Strategy, as the collapse of the Genoa Bridge in August 2018 has heightened financial and regulatory risks, and are relevant to Atlantia's rating in conjunction with other factors.

For more information on Fitch's ESG Relevance Scores, visit [www.fitchratings.com/esg](http://www.fitchratings.com/esg).

### RATING ACTIONS

ENTITY/DEBT	RATING	PRIOR
Autostrade per l'Italia SpA	LT IDR BB+  Downgrade	BBB+ 
	ST IDR B  Downgrade	F2 
Autostrade per l'Italia SpA/Debt/1 LT	LT BB+  Downgrade	BBB+ 
Atlantia S.p.A.		
Atlantia S.p.A./Debt/1 LT	LT BB+  Downgrade	BBB+ 
Atlantia S.p.A./Debt/2 LT	LT BB  Downgrade	BBB 
Aeroporti di Roma S.p.A	LT IDR BBB-  Downgrade	BBB+ 
	ST IDR F3  Downgrade	F2 
/Debt/1 LT	LT BBB-  Downgrade	BBB+ 

Additional information is available on [www.fitchratings.com](http://www.fitchratings.com)

## **FITCH RATINGS ANALYSTS**

### Primary Rating Analyst

Danilo Quattromani

Senior Director

+39 02 879087 275

Fitch Italia Società Italiana per il rating, S.p.A.

Via Morigi, 6 Ingresso Via Privata Maria Teresa, 8

Milan 20123

### Secondary Rating Analyst

Paolo Alessi

Director

+39 02 879087 299

### Committee Chairperson

Ian Dixon

Managing Director

+44 20 3530 1815

## **MEDIA CONTACTS**

Athos Larkou

London

+44 20 3530 1549

[athos.larkou@thefitchgroup.com](mailto:athos.larkou@thefitchgroup.com)

Stefano Bravi

Milan

+39 02 879087 281

[stefano.bravi@fitchratings.com](mailto:stefano.bravi@fitchratings.com)

## **Applicable Criteria**

Airports Rating Criteria (pub. 23 Feb 2018)

Rating Criteria for Infrastructure and Project Finance (pub. 27 Jul 2018)

Toll Roads, Bridges and Tunnels Rating Criteria (pub. 30 Jul 2018)

Short-Term Ratings Criteria (pub. 02 May 2019)

Parent and Subsidiary Rating Linkage (pub. 27 Sep 2019)

## **Additional Disclosures**

Dodd-Frank Rating Information Disclosure Form

Solicitation Status

Endorsement Policy

## **DISCLAIMER**

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK:

[HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](https://www.fitchratings.com/understandingcreditratings). IN ADDITION, RATING

DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT [WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM](http://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM). PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. DIRECTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS RELEVANT INTERESTS ARE AVAILABLE AT [HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/SITE/REGULATORY](https://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/SITE/REGULATORY). FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.

## **COPYRIGHT**

Copyright © 2019 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings and in making other reports (including forecast information), Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings and reports should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating or a report will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings and its reports, Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings and forecasts of financial and other information are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings and forecasts can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating or forecast was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind, and Fitch does not represent or warrant that the report or any of its contents will meet any of the requirements of a recipient of the report. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion and reports made by Fitch are based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings and reports are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating or a report. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at any time for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a



recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.

For Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and South Korea only: Fitch Australia Pty Ltd holds an Australian financial services license (AFS license no. 337123) which authorizes it to provide credit ratings to wholesale clients only. Credit ratings information published by Fitch is not intended to be used by persons who are retail clients within the meaning of the Corporations Act 2001

Fitch Ratings, Inc. is registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (the "NRSRO"). While certain of the NRSRO's credit rating subsidiaries are listed on Item 3 of Form NRSRO and as such are authorized to issue credit ratings on behalf of the NRSRO (see <https://www.fitchratings.com/site/regulatory>), other credit rating subsidiaries are not listed on Form NRSRO (the "non-NRSROs") and therefore credit ratings issued by those subsidiaries are not issued on behalf of the NRSRO. However, non-NRSRO personnel may participate in determining credit ratings issued by or on behalf of the NRSRO.

## **SOLICITATION STATUS**

The ratings above were solicited and assigned or maintained at the request of the rated entity/issuer or a related third party. Any exceptions follow below.

## **Endorsement Policy**

Fitch's approach to ratings endorsement so that ratings produced outside the EU may be used by regulated entities within the EU for regulatory purposes, pursuant to the terms of the EU Regulation with respect to credit rating agencies, can be found on the EU Regulatory Disclosures page. The endorsement status of all International ratings is provided within the entity summary page for each rated entity and in the transaction detail pages for all structured finance transactions on the Fitch website. These disclosures are updated on a daily basis.

## **Fitch Updates Terms of Use & Privacy Policy**

We have updated our Terms of Use and Privacy Policies which cover all of Fitch Group's websites. Learn more.